



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/360,582	07/26/1999	BRANDON W. BLACKBURN	MIT-8312	4382

7590 11/01/2007
PATRICK J O'SHEA ESQ
SAMUELS GAUTHIER & STEVENS LLP
225 FRANKLIN STREET SUITE 3300
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER

MONDT, JOHANNES P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3663

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

11/01/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/360,582	Applicant(s) BLACKBURN, BRANDON W.	
	Examiner Johannes P. Mondt	Art Unit 3663	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5,7 and 8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,5,7 and 8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 August 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Amendment filed 8/22/07 forms the basis for this Office Action. In said Amendment applicant amended the Specification and the Drawings (Replacement Sheets for Figures 1 and 2). Comments on Remarks are included below under "Response to Arguments".

The amendments to the Specification and the Drawings per said Amendment are herewith approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. **Claims 1, 4-5, 7 and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In particular, a method of cooling a low Z target material for a neutron assembly or a liquid cooling system for a neutron assembly or a neutron source assembly having a liquid cooled target with cooling system, including a nozzle submerged in liquid gallium as recited in independent claims 1 (line 3), claim 5, line 7) and claim 8 (line 5) has not been disclosed in the original Specification including original claims. According to the

Art Unit: 3663

Specification, the "liquid gallium fills chamber 40", while the "source includes a nozzle 34". However, not disclosed is whether nozzle (shown over or in chamber 40 (Figure 2) is in said chamber 40, nor whether, even if nozzle 34 is in chamber 40, said chamber is filled enough so as to cause said nozzle to be submerged in said liquid gallium.

Reference is also made to "initial tests, using water coolant" in a "submerged jet impingement configuration" (Specification, page 6, lines 18-20 as originally filed).

However, "submerged jet" does not necessarily mean "submerged nozzle" (see, e.g., Pais et al, IEEE, 1994 Intersociety Conference on Thermal Phenomena, "Single-Phase Heat Transfer Characteristics of Submerged Jet Impingement Cooling using JP-5", pp. 178-183, especially title, abstract, and page 182), while, even arguendo, the experiments "to illustrate the effectiveness of gallium cooling" (pages 7-8 of original Specification) are described without reference to either submerged jet or submerged nozzle. In conclusion, original Specification and claims do not support the amendment to claims 1, 5 and 8 and to dependent claims 2, 4, and 6-7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. ***Claims 1, 4, 5 and 7*** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers (5,392,319) (previously made of record as Prior Art and cited in

Specification) in view of Lidsky et al (previously made of record), Pais et al (IEEE 0-7803-1372-0, 1994) and Alger (4,141,224).

On claim 1: Eggers teaches (see title, abstract, and Figures 1, 10-11) a method of cooling a low Z target material of a neutron source assembly, comprising: providing flow of liquid coolant (light water and D₂O; col. 12, l. 51 – col.13, l. 68) to a low Z (col. 6, l. 13-58 and col. 7, l. 5-20) target material within the neutron assembly (target support region 116, on target carriage 26; target material is inherently part of the neutron assembly: no target material, no neutrons) (loc.cit.) to cool the low Z target material (loc.cit.).

Eggers does not necessarily teach said liquid gallium as liquid coolant. However, it would have been obvious to include the teaching of liquid gallium as coolant for an irradiation target in view of Lidsky et al (col. 7, l. 10-20) being at least suitable as equivalent to water (loc.cit.). It has been held that the selection of a particular material known in the art to be suitable for its intended purpose would be entirely obvious. *In re Leshin* 125 USPQ 416. Eggers further teaches the liquid coolant 134 (col. 9, l. 28) to be provided to a non-bombarded surface (inside surface of 116 within 26 rather than the outside surface bombarded by the ion beam 22 (see Figures 1, 10).

Eggers does not necessarily teach the limitation of using “a nozzle submerged in said liquid gallium, a submerged jet of concentrated liquid gallium in a direction normal to a non-bombarded surface of the low Z target material”. However, it would have been obvious to include said limitation in view of Pais et al, who, in art (inter alia on X-ray medical devices) on cooling by jet impingement (title, abstract, Introduction, page 178),

Art Unit: 3663

hence in this regard analogous to Eggers, teach hitting the target in a direction normal to a non-bombarded surface of said low Z target material (see Figure 1 and Introduction, page 178) with a submerged jet (title, abstract) in which cooling method the nozzle is preferably completely submerged in the cooling liquid (see "Fully submerged Nozzle and Surface", page 182, and compare Figure 7 for the case of submerged nozzle with Figure 8, showing a superior heat transfer in the former case, also summarized in the conclusions (page 181-182). *Motivation* to include the teaching by Pais et al in the invention by Eggers derives from the enhanced heat transfer and consequent higher cooling efficiency, as illustrated by Figure 7 when compared with Figure 8 in Pais et al and the Conclusions by Pais et al of larger heat transfer coefficients (page 182). Parenthetically, the physics behind the superior heat transfer of submerged jets over free surface jet impingement has long been understood: see, e.g., Christiaens et al (5,795,063), especially the discussion in col. 8, l. 35-63), being due to heat transfer by turbulence. Said turbulence arises whenever a submerged jet mixes with the surrounding liquid and hence applies also to the topography of Eggers.

Eggers does not necessarily teach the limitations on reservoir provision and specific pumping, as claimed (final five lines of claim 1). However, it would have been obvious to include said limitations in view of the cooling apparatus as taught by Alger et al comprising a liquid coolant reservoir 23 (col. 2, l. 23-24) while the liquid coolant is pumped from the reservoir (through 27, see col. 2, l. 24 and Figures 1 and 2) through the nozzle 29 (col. 2, l. 57-60) such that the coolant impinges on the target (in application to Eggers low Z) target material and cools the target material (see rejection

Art Unit: 3663

of claim 1 above), from the neutron source assembly directly to a heat exchanger 28 (col. 2, l. 24-27) to remove heat from the liquid coolant (a cooling system necessarily effects the exchange of heat and hence is a heat exchanger), means for recirculating said liquid coolant between said reservoir 23, said heat exchanger 28 and said accelerator based neutron source 11 in the form of pump 27 (thus meeting the additional limitation defined by claim 7) and nozzle 29 (col. 2, l. 24 and col. 2, l. 28-30). Note that recirculation is implied by the disclosure of a "closed loop" (see abstract).

Motivation to include the teaching by Alger et al in the invention by Egger and Lidsky et al derives from the more efficient cooling through improved circulation as expressed by Alger et al (col. 1, l. 19-33 and 45-65) as is also generally known in the art of cooling apparatus as conventional, while circulating enables re-use, which is important for a more expensive coolant such as gallium, which expense is, however amply compensated by the much higher coefficient of thermal conductivity (see applicant's admission in this regard on page 7 of the Specification).

On claim 4: the target material in Eggers comprises beryllium (col. 6, l. 48-51).

On claim 5: Eggers teaches a neutron source assembly 10 (title, abstract, col. 5, l. 40 – col. 6, l. 58) having a liquid cooled target (light water and D₂O; col. 12, l. 51 – col. 13, l. 68), comprising: an accelerator based neutron source 16/26/116 (accelerator 16 (col. 7, l. 5-20), target carriage 26 and target 116 (col. 7, 5-20 and col. 8, l. 62-66) including a low Z target material within the accelerator-based neutron source (such as boron or beryllium) (col. 6, l. 13-59) (namely: low Z target 116 on target carriage 26; see col. 7, l. 5-20 and col. 8, l. 62-66) that is bombarded by accelerated particles (through

Art Unit: 3663

proton accelerator 16; see col. 6, l. 13-51) to produce a neutron flux (col. 6, l. 13-59); and a cooling system (72/90 a/o, see above) to circulate liquid coolant (light water and D₂O; see above) through said accelerator based neutron source (namely: through 16/26/116) to cool the low Z target material.

Eggers does not necessarily teach said liquid gallium as liquid coolant. However, it would have been obvious to include the teaching of liquid gallium as coolant for an irradiation target in view of Lidsky et al (col. 7, l. 10-20) being at least suitable as equivalent to water (loc.cit.). It has been held that the selection of a particular material known in the art to be suitable for its intended purpose would be entirely obvious. In re Leshin 125 USPQ 416. Eggers further teaches the liquid coolant 134 (col. 9, l. 28) to be provided to a non-bombarded surface (inside surface of 116 within 26 rather than the outside surface bombarded by the ion beam 22 (see Figures 1, 10).

Eggers does not necessarily teach the limitation "said nozzle being submerged in said liquid gallium to provide a submerged jet of concentrated liquid gallium in a direction normal to a non-bombarded surface of the low Z target material".

However, whether said nozzle is submerged in liquid gallium and provides a submerged jet or not are limitations of intended use within the framework of the device invention of claim 5 (neutron source assembly being the device). Applicant is reminded that In reference to the claim language referring to "said nozzle being submerged" and "submerged jet", intended use and other types of functional language must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is

Art Unit: 3663

capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Furthermore, even arguendo, it would have been obvious to include said limitation in view of Pais et al, who, in art (inter alia on X-ray medical devices) on cooling by jet impingement (title, abstract, Introduction, page 178), hence in this regard analogous to Eggers, teach a target positioned in an assembly such that jets are capable to be directed and impinge normal to a non-bombarded surface of said low Z target material (see Figure 1 and Introduction, page 178) with a submerged jet (title, abstract) in which assembly the nozzle is preferably completely submerged in the cooling liquid (see "Fully submerged Nozzle and Surface", page 182, and compare Figure 7 for the case of submerged nozzle with Figure 8, showing a superior heat transfer in the former case, also summarized in the conclusions (page 181-182). *Motivation* is spelled out by Pais et al to be the enhanced heat transfer, hence better cooling (see "Conclusions", page 182). Parenthetically, the physics behind the superior heat transfer of submerged jets over free surface jet impingement has long been understood: see, e.g., Christiaens et al (5,795,063), especially the discussion in col. 8, l. 35-63), recited here not for teaching but for fact only.

Eggers nor Lidsky et al nor Pais et al necessarily teach the further inclusions of the cooling system as claimed (final 7 lines of claim 5). However, it would have been obvious to include said limitations in view of the cooling apparatus as taught by Alger et

Art Unit: 3663

al comprising a liquid coolant reservoir 23 (col. 2, l. 23-24) while the liquid coolant is pumped from the reservoir (through 27, see col. 2, l. 24 and Figures 1 and 2) through the nozzle 29 (col. 2, l. 57-60) such that the coolant impinges on the target (in application to Eggers low Z) target material and cools the target material (see rejection of claim 1 above), from the neutron source assembly directly to a heat exchanger 28 (col. 2, l. 24-27) to remove heat from the liquid coolant (a cooling system necessarily effects the exchange of heat and hence is a heat exchanger), means for serially recirculating said liquid coolant between said reservoir 23, said heat exchanger 28 and said accelerator based neutron source 11 in the form of pump 27 (thus meeting the additional limitation defined by claim 7) which satisfies "means for serially circulating" under 112, sixth paragraph (see pump 14 (Figure 1 in the Specification)) and nozzle 29 (col. 2, l. 24 and col. 2, l. 28-30). Note that recirculation is implied by the disclosure of a "closed loop" (see abstract). *Motivation* to include the teaching by Alger et al in the invention by Egger and Lidsky et al derives from the more efficient cooling through improved circulation as expressed by Alger et al (col. 1, l. 19-33 and 45-65) as is also generally known in the art of cooling apparatus as being conventional, while circulating enables re-use, which is important for a more expensive coolant such as gallium, which expense is, however amply compensated by the much higher coefficient of thermal conductivity (see applicant's admission in this regard on page 7 of the Specification).

3. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggers in view of Lidsky et al, Pais et al and Alger et al (all previously cited).

Eggers teaches a liquid cooling system for a neutron source assembly (title, abstract, col. 5-17; Figures 1 and 10-11), said cooling system comprising: a reservoir (inherently existing behind check valve 92 of 90 as otherwise conduit 90 could not deliver said liquid coolant (col. 8, l. 24-29) (see Figures 1 and 10)); a heat exchanger 132 or 226 (col. 9, l. 23-35 and col. 13, l. 34). Eggers also teach a low Z target material (116 on 26) within the neutron source assembly 10 (col. 5, 63-68, col. 6, l. 13-58, col. 7, l. 5-20 and col. 8, l. 62-63).

Eggers does not necessarily teach said liquid gallium as liquid coolant. However, it would have been obvious to include the teaching of liquid gallium as coolant for an irradiation target in view of Lidsky et al (col. 7, l. 10-20) being at least suitable as equivalent to water (loc.cit.). It has been held that the selection of a particular material known in the art to be suitable for its intended purpose would be entirely obvious. In re Leshin 125 USPQ 416. Eggers further teaches the liquid coolant 134 (col. 9, l. 28) to be provided to a non-bombarded surface (inside surface of 116 within 26 rather than the outside surface bombarded by the ion beam 22 (see Figures 1, 10).

Eggers does not necessarily teach the limitation "a nozzle, said nozzle being submerged in said liquid gallium providing a submerged jet of concentrated liquid gallium in a direction normal to a non-bombarded surface of the low Z target material".

However, apart from the nozzle itself, whether said nozzle is submerged in liquid gallium and provides a submerged jet or not are limitations of intended use within the framework of the device invention of claim 5 (neutron source assembly being the device). Applicant is reminded that In reference to the claim language referring to "said

nozzle being submerged" and "submerged jet", intended use and other types of functional language must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to a process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Furthermore, arguendo, it would have been obvious to include said limitation in view of Pais et al, who, in art (inter alia on X-ray medical devices) on cooling by jet impingement (title, abstract, Introduction, page 178), hence in this regard analogous to Eggers, teach a target positioned in an assembly such that jets are capable to be directed and impinge normal to a non-bombarded surface of said low Z target material (see Figure 1 and Introduction, page 178) with a submerged jet (title, abstract) in which assembly a nozzle is preferably completely submerged in the cooling liquid (see "Fully submerged Nozzle and Surface", page 182, and compare Figure 7 for the case of submerged nozzle with Figure 8, showing a superior heat transfer in the former case, also summarized in the conclusions (page 181-182). *Motivation* is spelled out by Pais et al to be the enhanced heat transfer, hence better cooling (see "Conclusions", page 182). Parenthetically, the physics behind the superior heat transfer of submerged jets over free surface jet impingement has long been understood: see, e.g., Christiaens et al (5,795,063), especially the discussion in col. 8, l. 35-63).

Eggers does not necessarily teach the claimed means for serially circulating.

However, it would have been obvious to include said means in view of the cooling apparatus as taught by Alger et al comprising a liquid coolant reservoir 23 (col. 2, l. 23-24) while the liquid coolant is pumped from the reservoir (through 27, see col. 2, l. 24 and Figures 1 and 2) through the nozzle 29 (col. 2, l. 57-60) to the (in application to Eggers low Z) target material to cool the target material (see rejection of claim 1 above) and through a heat exchanger 28 (col. 2, l. 24-27) to remove heat from the liquid coolant (a cooling system necessarily effects the exchange of heat and hence is a heat exchanger), as well as means for serially circulating said liquid coolant between said reservoir 23, said heat exchanger 28 and said accelerator based neutron source 11 in the form of pump 27 and nozzle 29 (col. 2, l. 24 and col. 2, l. 28-30). *Motivation* to include the teaching by Alger et al in the invention by Egger and Lidsky et al derives from the more efficient cooling through improved circulation as expressed by Alger et al (col. 1, l. 19-33 and 45-65) as is also generally known in the art of cooling apparatus as conventional, while circulating enables re-use, which is important for a more expensive coolant such as gallium, which expense is, however amply compensated by the much higher coefficient of thermal conductivity (see applicant's admission in this regard on page 7 of the Specification). In the combined invention, the liquid gallium from the reservoir through the nozzle impinges on the surface of the low Z target material within the neutron source assembly and is transferred directly to the heat exchanger, and from said heat exchanger to said reservoir by virtue of the close loop taught by Alger et al (see abstract).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 8/22/07 have been fully considered but on the whole they are not persuasive, although objections to the Drawings and the Specification have been successfully overcome by said Amendment. Therefore, Arguments ad A and B in Remarks are moot.

With regard to Argument C on the rejections under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, applicant argues that the limitation "submerged nozzle" is disclosed because (a) cross-sectional Figure 2 shows nozzle 34 to be in chamber 40 and (b) the Specification discloses the liquid gallium fills the chamber. However, any positioning of the nozzle above said chamber would render the same cross-sectional Figure 2, being only in two dimensions, while even arguendo assuming nozzle 34 to be in chamber 40, one of ordinary skill would interpret "a liquid-filled chamber" not to imply complete filling of the chamber with the liquid, as shown for instance by Satterthwaite et al (3,267,730), who characterize the container of Figure 2 to be a "liquid-filled container" despite the evidence of a partial filling by the liquid helium 12 of the container 10 (see column 1 for the Figure legend, and see Figure 2. Additional evidence of the meaning of "filled" can be seen from such expressions as "filled to the brim" (see American Heritage Dictionary, 2003), and those used to patentably distinguish "completely filled" and "partially filled" (see Roser (5,148,939) in a patent on the storing of a liquid in a container, especially claims 3, 6 and 9). Therefore, neither applicant's argument that the nozzle is disclosed in the chamber, nor applicant's argument that the chamber is completely filled with liquid is persuasive. Therefore, the rejection under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, stands.

With regard to Argument D on the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) of claims 1, 5 and dependent claims over Eggers in view of Lidsky, Pais et al and Alger, applicant argues against combining Lidsky with Eggers on account that "liquid gallium dissolves aluminum or copper in a matter of minutes or a few hours depending on temperature", which is not persuasive because at least copper, one of the material embodiments in Eggers (as also admitted by applicant) is viable for a liquid gallium container embodiment: liquid gallium containers are known in the art of reservoirs for liquid gallium, as witnessed by Morel (6,258,620 B1). Furthermore, even arguendo, a container or reservoir can be found that does not dissolve in liquid gallium, and hence a simple material adjustment for the container walls is all that otherwise would be required to enable the combination. In further response to motivation arguments by applicant: examiner has specifically and meticulously stated the motivation for each inclusion of additional teaching which applicant does not address on substance. Additional allegations, i.e., the alleged "teaching away" from each other (i.e., of the references) are not even provided with specific arguments and examiner must therefore assume that the alleged impossibility of using copper for the liquid gallium container is at the root of applicant's arguments. Applicant repeats the same arguments for independent claim 5 and dependent claims. Therefore, said rejection under 35 USC 103(a) stands.

With regard to Argument E on the rejection under 35 USC 103(a) of claim 8, applicant's only additional argument appears to be that Alger allegedly does not disclose or render obvious serially circulating the liquid gallium". However, applicant's argument fails to persuade because, as also admitted by applicant, in Alger at least

Art Unit: 3663

coolant leaving the target chamber is returned to the reservoir, which for said liquid gallium coolant completes the serial circulation. Therefore, said rejection under 35 USC 103(a) of claim 8 stands.

For the above reasons the rejections under 35 USC 112, and 35 USC 103(a) previously provided stand and are repeated herewith.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johannes P. Mondt whose telephone number is 571-272-1919. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 18:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jack W. Keith can be reached on 571-272-6878. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 3663

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JPM

October 27, 2007

Primary Patent Examiner:


Johannes Mondt (TC 3600, Art Unit: 3663)